



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

well in this connection to quote from Sealsfield's letter to Cotta (1828) which accompanied the shipment of about fifteen separate contributions; of these (and others that were to follow) Sealsfield says: "Sie sind teils ganz von mir teils in der Übersetzung so verändert, dass sie füglich mein Eigentum genannt werden mögen." This not only throws light on our author's method of gathering material; for, more than that, there remains the possibility that some of the sketches enumerated in the same letter were worked into *Lebensbilder* and the other novels.

But, in justice to Sealsfield, it should also be stated that in no case could the relation of *Siebzehn, achtundzwanzig und fünfzig* to *A Sketch from Life* be characterized as a mere plagiarism. The treatment of the plain outlines is so original, the very story so thoroughly Sealsfieldian in its vivacity and immediacy of dialog and milieu that we may regard the English sketch as a legitimate source of the German.

As somewhat akin to the subject, I wish to mention Sealsfield's remark in the introduction to *Morton* (p. 19 of the 12° ed.): "Zwei dieser Lebensbilder sind zuerst in einer amerikanischen Zeitschrift erschienen, und später in einer Londoner abgedruckt worden." Without having given specific attention to the sources of the American novels of Sealsfield, I would point out to special students of *Lebensbilder aus beiden Hemisphären* that the names of the persons prove Sealsfield's familiarity with the American "Unterhaltungs-Literatur" of the twenties. Cf. particularly *A Tale of the West-Indies*, anon., in the *Mirror*. The hero is named Morton.

OTTO HELLER.

Prague, Bibliotheca Cesarea Regia.

#### THE RULE OF THREE ACTORS IN FRENCH SIXTEENTH CENTURY TRAGEDY.

The familiar usage of the Greek stage which allowed only three actors besides mutes and members of the chorus was handed down to French

playwrights in a form modified by transmission through Seneca's academic drama. The practical advantages secured to the Greek dramatist by having only a limited number of actors to train had small weight with the Roman author, writing, as he did, for a reading rather than a theater-going public. Accordingly, we are not surprised to find that, while usually making only three characters appear on the stage at once, Seneca does occasionally so interpret the Greek rule as to allow four speaking actors, any three of whom may enter into conversation, provided the fourth remains temporarily silent.<sup>1</sup> Such treatment follows the Greek custom theoretically, but practically makes necessary at least four actors, none of whom are mutes, a usage unknown to extant Attic tragedy.

The two examples that can be cited from Seneca of his departure from the Greek usage will make his position clear. In *Oedipus*, Act II, Creon, after announcing to Oedipus the approach of Tiresias and Manto, becomes silent, leaving the conversation to the new-comers and Oedipus, but not quitting the stage till the chorus begins some hundred lines further on. A still clearer case is found in the last act of *Agamemnon*, where Cassandra is the silent witness of the conversation between Electra, Aegisthus, and Clytemnestra, but speaks as soon as Electra leaves the stage. Four actors are necessary in both of these cases, but three is the largest number engaged in a conversation. Seneca thus modifies slightly the Greek usage, doing so in a manner not inconsistent with Horace's dramatic precept,

. . . nec quarta loqui persona laboret.<sup>2</sup>

Now, no one will claim that either the Greek or the Senecan usage was observed in the French medieval drama.<sup>3</sup> Furthermore, neither Hardy<sup>4</sup> nor the seventeenth century classic dramatists<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Henri Weil, *Revue archéologique*, 1865, I, pp. 21-35, who comes to the same conclusions from a different point of view.

<sup>2</sup> *Ars poetica*, 192.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Le Mystère du Viel Testament*, 441, seq.; *La Femme du roy de Portugal*, 20, seq.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *Scodase*, III, 2; *Mariamne*, V; *Meleagre*, II, 2.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Mairet, *Sophonisbe*, II, 3; III, 4; V, 5; Corneille, *Le Cid*, IV, 5; *Horace*, II, 6; *Héracius*, V, 3; *Pompée*, I, 1; Racine, *Andromaque*, III, 6; *Athalie*, II, 7.

limited themselves to three interlocutors. So strict a classicist as d'Aubignac, indeed, expressly permits the violation of the ancient custom.<sup>6</sup> There remains to be considered, however, the French classic tragedies of the sixteenth century, known to follow most closely their Greek and Latin models. If they can be shown to have imitated the Greek usage and to have done so after the manner of Seneca, another indication will be furnished of the academic nature and purpose of these French plays, their dependence upon the Greeks and especially upon Seneca.

The standard sources of information as to French sixteenth century tragedy are largely silent in regard to the rule of three actors. I have been able to find a discussion of the matter only in *Robert Garnier und die Antike Tragödie*<sup>7</sup> by Oscar Mysin, whose views are of no great value in this connection, since he asserts that the law of the three actors "sich auch bei Seneca durchweg bewahrt findet," and consequently is persuaded that Garnier is violating the rule when he is following Seneca's usage. Mysin takes up examples from Garnier's *M. Antoine*, which are examined below. His original investigation applies to this author only, but he states that the rule "wurde von den Kunstrichtern der Renaissance gleichfalls als Regel aufgestellt," quoting from Vauquelin,

"Et ne parle vn quatriesme en l'Etage avec trois :  
Trois parlant seulement suffisent à la fois."<sup>8</sup>

Although this translation of the line already quoted from Horace is of decided interest, its occurrence does not prove that the rule of three interlocutors was observed by the French dramatists of the sixteenth century, since they cannot be presumed to have followed the advice of any contemporary critic, certainly not that of Vauquelin, writing, as he did, in 1597, after most of the dramatists had ceased to compose. It is true that the principle enunciated in Vauquelin's passage agreed with contemporary usage, but if we wish to be certain of the rules followed by French dramatists, we cannot rely upon this statement

only, but must make an examination of the plays themselves.

In order to determine the French usage, therefore, I have examined all the tragedies of the period in question that were accessible to me in this country. The list is not exhaustive, but, as it contains nineteen tragedies, including all that have come down from Jodelle, Garnier, and Montchrestien, I believe that it is long enough to show what rule was followed at the time. If the great majority of these plays are found to keep the Greek rule, or Seneca's modification of it, such uniformity can scarcely be due to chance, but seems rather to result from the fact that three was the largest number of interlocutors allowed by these French classicists, and that any play which introduced a fourth interlocutor abandoned in that respect its classic technique and approached the usage of the contemporary irregular drama.

The tragedies examined are the following: Beza, *Abraham sacrificant* (1550); Jodelle, *Cleopatra captive* (1552), *Didon se sacrificant* (1560); Melin de Saint-Gelais, *Sophonisba* (1555); Grevin, *Cesar* (1560)<sup>9</sup>; Bounin, *La Soltane* (1561); Garnier, *Porcie* (1568), *Hippolyte* (1573), *Cornelie* (1574), *M. Antoine* (1578), *La Troade* (1579), *Antigone* (1580), *Les Juives* (1583); Montchrestien, *Sophonisbe* (1596, republished in 1601 as *La Carthaginoise*), *L'Escossoise* (1601), *Les Lacènes* (1601), *Aman* (1601), *David* (1601), *Hector* (1604). It has been found that, besides the chorus and mutes, two actors, who could take different parts at different times, would suffice for *Cornelie*, *L'Escossoise*, and *David*; that *Didon*, *Cesar*, *La Soltane*, *La Troade*, *M. Antoine*,<sup>10</sup> *Hector*, *Aman*, and *Les Lacènes* require four; while three are sufficient for the other plays mentioned. Thus it appears that the strictly Greek usage is not infrequently violated. It is pertinent to inquire, however, whether Seneca's modification of the Greek custom is also violated, whether the French abandoned the rule of three interlocutors,

<sup>9</sup> Grevin's usage agrees with that of Muret in his *Julius Cesar*, the Latin original of the former's tragedy.

<sup>10</sup> Four actors are here sufficient, for the *enfants de Cleopatre* are considered as mutes, saying only, "Adieu, Madame," and "Allons." These interpellations are too insignificant to allow the children who make them to be seriously considered as speaking actors.

<sup>6</sup> See Arnaud, *Théories dramatiques*, 246-7, Paris, 1888.

<sup>7</sup> Leipzig dissertation, 1891.

<sup>8</sup> *L'Art poétique*, II, 465-466.

just as they required more than three actors. To answer such inquiry I shall consider individually the eight tragedies which make necessary the fourth player.

At the close of a conversation in *Didon* between Ascaigne, Palinure, and Achate, the speakers note the approach of Enée, who begins to soliloquize as soon as they are silent. The rapidity of this change renders it unlikely that the same actor played more than one of the four rôles, so that four players seem necessary, although there are not more than three who speak together. In *Cesar*, Act III, Calpurnie converses with her nurse, then with Cesar and Decime Brute, then with the nurse again. Apparently the nurse does not leave the stage; she certainly has nothing to say as long as the two men are present. We have, therefore, four actors, of whom only three engage in conversation at a time. Later dramatists would have divided this act into three scenes, but at this time such divisions are seldom made. Again, the fifth act of *La Soltane* presents eunuchs whose spokesman converses with Moustapha and the Sophe, but has nothing to say when the Soltan enters, even when addressed by the latter. In *La Troade*, Act II, Helen, Andromache, Astyanax, and Ulysse are each represented by an actor, but only three unite in conversation, for Helen ceases to speak as soon as she has called attention to the approach of Ulysse.

Now Mysing correctly notes that "in M. Antoine müssen in der Szene zwischen Cleopatre, Eras, Charmion, Diomedé vier Schauspieler nötig sein (V. 665-685), ebenso in der Schlusszene dieser Tragödie, wo Cleopatre, Euftron, Charmion, Eras gleichzeitig auf der Bühne sind." He fails to perceive, however, that this is no violation of Seneca's usage, for, in the first case, Cleopatre finishes her conversation with Eras and Charmion before turning to Diomedé, who has previously said nothing and had nothing said to him. He replies to Cleopatre, but the other women do not speak again. It seems probable that Diomedé does not enter till after Cleopatre has finished her conversation with the women, for his presence has not been remarked up to that time. The absence of stage-directions prevents this fact from being obvious. The second case mentioned by Mysing is clearly not contrary to Seneca, for Charmion

has nothing to say till Euftron has left the stage.

A similar situation is found in the fourth act of *Hector*, where Hecube becomes silent upon the arrival of Antenor, allowing the conversation to be carried on by Priam, Andromache, and the last arrival. The same thing occurs in the fifth act with the rôles changed, for there Andromache leaves the conversation to Priam, Hecube, and the messenger. The fourth act of *Aman* requires more than three actors, but only three converse together.

It is clear that in all the cases mentioned there is nothing opposed to Seneca's usage, for more than three actors are needed in the plays, but more than three do not converse together, a fact that would be more readily apparent if the scene divisions were marked and the stage-directions given. There is, however, a solitary violation of the rule in the third act of *Les Lacènes*, where Cratesiclea converses with Leonidas, Agis, and Pausanias. This is a comparatively late play and may have been influenced by the success of Hardy's irregular dramas. Its failure to conform in a single instance is not sufficient to break down the proof offered by eighteen plays of the existence of the rule. My examination of the tragedies shows, therefore, that the Greek usage holds for ten plays, the Senecan modification of it for eight, and that only one play allows the fourth interlocutor. These conclusions, of course, indicate that Seneca's influence was paramount rather than that of the Greeks, for, as the majority of his plays follow the Greek usage, it was possible for a French playwright to adhere to the Greek rule, though imitating Seneca alone, while one who introduced a fourth actor, but had never more than three interlocutors, departed from Greek usage, though still adhering to Seneca.

A few other facts may be cited to show that the French obedience to the Greek rule or Seneca's modification of it was not mere chance. Garnier, who observes the rule in all his tragedies, violates it in his tragi-comedy, *Bradamante*,<sup>11</sup> just as Hardy did later in his works of the same genre.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>11</sup> IV, 5 and V, 4 and 5.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. *Ariadne*, v, last scene; *Cornélie*, iv, 4; *Arsacome*, i, 2.

Such usage can scarcely be a mere coincidence. Again, cases occur in which two or more characters are treated as one, apparently to avoid the dividing of the conversation among four. Thus the eunuchs in *La Soltane* speak together, that is, one probably speaks while the others remain mute. So, too, in the fourth and fifth acts of *Les Iuifves* the wives of Zedekiah discourse frequently and at length, but always in unison, so that only one speaking actor would be required for the two rôles and only three interlocutors would be employed. As it would add dramatic interest to individualize the queens by dividing their rôles, Garnier's failure to do so in his masterpiece points to the fact that he was fettered in this respect by an academic convention.<sup>13</sup>

A further indication that the number of interlocutors was intentionally limited to three is found in the fifth act of *Hector*, where a messenger comes to describe the hero's death to Priam, Hecube, and Andromache. As the messenger approaches, Andromache faints and the chorus cries :

"Retirons la, mes sœurs, dedans ceste maison.  
Cela vient à propos afin qu'elle n'escoute  
Ce message de mort que tant elle redoute."

But as Andromache reappears after the messenger has ceased speaking and laments Hector's death at length, the author does not appear to have had her removed from the stage merely to avoid showing us her grief. Had he allowed her to remain, she must have joined Priam and Hecube in questioning the messenger, thus making four interlocutors. Her retirement to the house is "à propos," not to avoid the expression of emotion, which is the soul of sixteenth century tragedy, but to enable Montchrestien to adhere to the academic tradition that forbade a conversation in which four actors took part.

<sup>13</sup> It may be argued that Garnier makes his ambassadors speak as one man in *Bradamante*, where the law of three interlocutors is freely violated, and that therefore the manner in which the queens speak in *Les Iuifves* is no proof of the observance of the law, but it must be noted that these ambassadors are introduced merely to bring about the dénouement, so that nothing is to be gained by their differentiation. The case of the queens, moreover, is not cited as absolute proof of the existence of the law, but merely as tending to confirm facts already stated in regard to it.

The evidence stated convinces me that the Senecan usage was law in French sixteenth century tragedy, but, before concluding, I desire to mention briefly the position of certain theorists in regard to this point of dramatic technique. Aristotle had mentioned in the fourth chapter of his *Poetics* that Sophocles was the introducer of the third actor, a statement repeated by Diogenes Laertius<sup>14</sup> and Suidas.<sup>15</sup> As none of these expressly prohibited the introduction of a fourth actor, it is upon Horace<sup>16</sup> that the burden of the responsibility falls, for even if he did not intend to formulate a law, he expressed himself in a manner that could be readily interpreted as forbidding at least a fourth interlocutor. Among Italians Castelvetro, who is important in French dramatic history as the first formulator of the rule of the three unities, not only says nothing of Horace's precept, but completely misunderstands the statements of Aristotle and Diogenes Laertius concerning the introduction of the third actor by Sophocles. He declares that they meant that "Sophocle operò che i contrafacitori fossero tre, cio è tre maniere, vna de' ballatori, vn altra de' cantori, e vn altra de' sonatori, doue prima per Thespi non erano se non vna, che conteneua ballatori, cantori, e sonatori insieme, e per Eschilo due, cio è vna che conteneua ballatori soli, e vna altra, che conteneua cantori, e sonatori insieme."<sup>17</sup> Evidently a law of three actors means nothing to him.

Among French theorists Du Bellay does not descend to dramatic detail in his *Defense et Illustration*. His friend Ronsard, more definite than he in other matters, says nothing about the number of actors. Scaliger lays down no law as to the usage in tragedy, but he seems to be acquainted with Horace's direction, for, in speaking of another dramatic form, he declares, "Omne personarum genus introducere licet. Quatuor etiam in eadem Scena loqui, nulla religio est."<sup>18</sup> Jean de la Taille leaves minutiae to Aristotle and

<sup>14</sup> *Life of Plato*, xxxiv.

<sup>15</sup> In his *Lexicon*.

<sup>16</sup> See the quotation from his *Ars poetica* at the beginning of this article.

<sup>17</sup> *Poetica d'Aristotele vulgarizzata et sposta*, p. 87, edition of Bale, 1576.

<sup>18</sup> *Poetics*, III, cap. xcvii.

Horace, for "ie serois trop long à deduire par le menu ce propos que ce grand Aristote en ses Poëtiques, et apres luy Horace (mais non avec telle subtilité) ont continué plus amplement et mieux que moy."<sup>19</sup> Vauquelin de la Fresnaye, as quoted above, gives a clear statement of the rule, which he translates directly from Horace. As he wrote too late to influence most of the writers of tragedy in the sixteenth century, his lines are of value chiefly in showing the trend of contemporary thought and confirming facts established by examination of the plays.

This comparative neglect by critics of a rule which dramatists were careful to observe goes to show that the sixteenth century theorists did not lead the poets and that, when the two agree, it is rather because both go back to the same source than because the former's rules were followed by the latter. References to Horace by Ronsard and la Taille, taken in connection with Vauquelin's translation of his *Ars poetica*, indicate his influence upon those interested in the drama. It is undoubtedly from him that the dramatists derived the formal rule of three interlocutors, which they found illustrated by Seneca's plays.

To sum up briefly, I conclude that the Greek rule of three actors was interpreted by the French to mean three interlocutors, according to their understanding of Horace's precept and Seneca's usage; that the rule, thus modified, was carried out by the chief writers of French sixteenth century tragedy, by Beza, Jodelle, Saint-Gelais, Grevin, Bounin, Garnier; that Montchrestien violated it only once; that such usage is another indication of the academic nature of the French *genre* and of Seneca's powerful influence upon it; and that in this matter the sixteenth century dramatists followed the Latin masters directly, rather than the theorists of their own day.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER.

Amherst College.

# THE FAERIE QUEENE AND AMIS AND AMILOUN.

Embedded in the structure of the *Faerie Queene* are fragments of the medieval romances which present something of the curious interest of the bits of Roman wall and the like, here and there appearing in the foundations of some noble cathedral. The business of identifying the *disiecta membra* of these earlier, less pretentious poets, though something has been done,<sup>1</sup> is as yet by no means complete. No apology, therefore, is necessary in putting on record a somewhat obvious identification of this sort, hitherto unnoted in print; especially since the parallel proposed is of sufficient extent to illustrate Spenser's method of incorporating in his own the work of the elder romancers.

To summarize briefly parts of the 7th, 8th, and 9th cantos of the *Faerie Queene*, Book iv: Amoret, in the cave of the giant Lust, learns from her fellow prisoner, Aemylia, how she, keeping tryst with her lover, the Squire of Low Degree, with whom she had arranged "away to flit," found in his stead "the Carle of hellish kind," Lust, who has since confined her in his cave; whence they are all rescued later by Belpheobe . . . . .

Arthur slays the basilisk-eyed monster Corflambo, who is in pursuit of a squire holding a dwarf before him on his horse. From the squire—Placidus—he learns Aemylia's fate and also the fact that the Squire of Low Degree, when he arrived at the tryst, met there this giant Corflambo, who cast him into his dungeon. Here

<sup>1</sup> Thomas Warton, *Observations on the Faerie Queene*, 2nd ed., London, 1762, I, § 2: "Of Spenser's Imitations from Old Romances."

M. Walther, *Malory's Einfluss auf Spenser's Faerie Queene*. Heidelberg diss. Eisleben, 1898.

J. B. Fletcher, "Huo of Bordeaux and the Faerie Queene." *Journal of Germanic Philology*, II, pp. 203-112.

J. R. Macarthur, "The Influence of Huo of Bordeaux upon the Faerie Queene." *Journal of Germanic Philology*, IV, pp. 215-238.

E. K. Broadus, "The Red Cross Knight and *Lycbeus Desconus*." *Mod. Lang. Notes*, XVIII, p. 202 f.

J. J. Jusserand, *Literary History of the English People*, New York, 1906, vol. II, p. 495, mentions a parallel between Britomart's innamoramento and an incident in Ortufez de Calahorra's *Espejo de Principes*, etc., 1562.

<sup>19</sup> *L'Art de la Tragedie*, 3b.